



P1029(15710RRUS02)

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: Khalil et al

Serial No.: 10/712,879

Filed: November 13, 2003

For: Mobile IP Over VPN Communication Protocol

Group Art Unit: 2419

Examiner: Wong, Blanche

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION DATED MAY 8, 2009

In response to the Office Action mailed May 8, 2009, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims in light of the following Response.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date: July 31, 2009

Amy Kasper
Amy Kasper

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

1. The Examiner has withdrawn the prior basis for the rejection of Claims 1-7 and 16-20, and withdrawn the prior indication of allowability of Claims 8-15.
2. The Examiner objected to the abstract because it allegedly omitted the “gist of the invention.”
3. Claim 8 was objected to based on the antecedent basis for “a foreign network” in line 13, which should be “the foreign network” as recommended by the Examiner.
4. Claims 8-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Iyer U.S. Publication 2004/0073642 (hereafter “Iyer”).
5. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 11, 13-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Iyer in view of U.S. Publication 2005/0177722 of Vaarala et al (hereafter “Vaarala”).
6. Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Iyer in view of Vaarala , in further view of O’Neill (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0047322).
7. Claims 16-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over O’Neill in view of Iyer and Vaarala.